



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/328,391	06/09/1999	VINCENT BERGER	0154-2811-2	6762

22850 7590 02/20/2002

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC  
FOURTH FLOOR  
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER
----------

BROCK II; PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2815

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/328,391

Applicant(s)

BERGER ET AL.

Examiner

Paul E Brock II

Art Unit

2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,5,7-10,16,17 and 19-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6,11-15,18,23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 June 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Newly submitted claims 16, 17 and 19 – 22 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The subject matter of these claims are directed toward non-elected species as outlined in paper numbers 8 and 11.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 16, 17 and 19 – 22 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

2. This application contains claims 4, 5, 7 – 10, 16, 17 and 19 – 22 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper No. 11. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

### ***Drawings***

3. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on February 1, 2002 have been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 13, 14, 15 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosencher et al. (USPAT 5086327, Rosencher) in view of Katoh (USPAT 5041882).

With regard to claim 1, Rosencher discloses in figure 3 an electromagnetic wave detector. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 a stack of layers made of III-V semiconductor materials. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 a conduction band profile of the materials defining at least one quantum well (3), the quantum well having at least one first discrete energy level populated with electrons that are capable of passing to a second energy level under absorption of an electromagnetic wave. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 means for counting the electrons in the second energy level. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 wherein the stack of layers of semiconductor materials furthermore comprises a transfer barrier layer (4), and an electron storage layer (5) separated from the quantum well by the transfer barrier layer. Rosencher discloses in figure 4 wherein a thickness of the transfer barrier layer is about one order of magnitude greater than a thickness of the quantum well. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 wherein a lowest energy level of a conduction band of the transfer barrier layer being greater than the lower energy levels of the quantum well and the electron storage layers. Rosencher does not disclose that the conduction

Art Unit: 2815

band profile of the stack of layers of semiconductor materials decreases from the quantum well to the electron storage layer. Katoh teaches in column 3, lines 37 – 48 a lower energy level of a conduction band profile of a stack of layers of semiconductor materials decreases from a quantum well to a electron storage layer so as to further a flow of electrons from the second energy level to the electron storage layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the transfer barrier layer with a decreasing lower energy level of its conduction band of Katoh in the method of Rosencher in order to establish an electron accelerating electric field within the barrier layer as stated by Katoh in column 3, lines 37 – 48.

With regard to claim 2, Rosencher discloses in figure 3 wherein the stack of layers made of III-V semiconductor materials furthermore comprises a first barrier layer (2) and a third barrier layer (6), both of the first and third layers being made of semiconductor materials such that a lowest energy level of a conduction band of the both layers is respectively greater than a lowest energy level of the conduction band of the quantum well and of the electron storage layer.

With regard to claim 3, Katoh discloses in column 3, lines 37 – 48 wherein a decreasing profile of the lowest energy level of the conduction band of the transfer barrier layer is obtained with a semiconductor alloy having a composition varying from the quantum well to the electron storage layer.

With regard to claim 11, Rosencher teaches in the abstract the electromagnetic wave detector further comprising means for resetting the flow of the electrons in the storage layer.

With regard to claim 13, Rosencher discloses in figure 3 an electromagnetic wave detector. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 a stack of layers made of III-V semiconductor

Art Unit: 2815

materials. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 a conduction band profile of the materials defining at least one quantum well (3), the quantum well having at least one first discrete energy level populated with electrons that are capable of passing to a second energy level under absorption of an electro magnetic wave. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 a counting unit configured to count the electrons in the second energy level. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 wherein the stack of layers of semiconductor materials furthermore comprises a transfer barrier layer (4), and an electron storage layer (5) separated from the quantum well by the transfer barrier layer.

Rosencher discloses in figure 4 wherein a thickness of the transfer barrier layer is about one order of magnitude greater than a thickness of the quantum well. Rosencher discloses in figure 3 wherein a lowest energy level of a conduction band of the transfer barrier layer being greater than the lower energy levels of the quantum well and the electron storage layers. Rosencher does not disclose that the conduction band profile of the stack of layers of semiconductor materials decreases from the quantum well to the electron storage layer. Katoh teaches in column 3, lines 37 – 48 a lower energy level of a conduction band profile of a stack of layers of semiconductor materials decreases from a quantum well to a electron storage layer so as to further a flow of electrons from the second energy level to the electron storage layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the transfer barrier layer with a decreasing lower energy level of its conduction band of Katoh in the method of Rosencher in order to establish an electron accelerating electric field within the barrier layer as stated by Katoh in column 3, lines 37 – 48.

With regard to claim 14, Rosencher discloses in figure 3 wherein the stack of layers made of III-V semiconductor materials furthermore comprises a first barrier layer (2) and a third

Art Unit: 2815

barrier layer (6), both of the first and third layers being made of semiconductor materials such that a lowest energy level of a conduction band of the both layers is respectively greater than a lowest energy level of the conduction band of the quantum well and of the electron storage layer.

With regard to claim 15, Katoh discloses in column 3, lines 37 – 48 wherein a decreasing profile of the lowest energy level of the conduction band of the transfer barrier layer is obtained with a semiconductor alloy having a composition varying from the quantum well to the electron storage layer.

With regard to claim 23, Rosencher teaches in the abstract the electromagnetic wave detector further comprising means for resetting the flow of the electrons in the storage layer.

6. Claims 6, 12, 18 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosencher and Katoh as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Nanbu (JPPAT 361054673).

With regard to claims 6 and 18, Rosencher and Katoh do not teach that first and second ohmic contacts are located at the electron storage layer. Nanbu discloses in the Constitution section and figure 1 a first (4) and second (5) ohmic contacts, both of the first and second ohmic contacts being located at an electron storage layer (10) so as to carry out a measurement of photocurrent in a plane of the storage layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the ohmic contacts of Nanbu in the device of Rosencher and Katoh in order to stably realize electron mobility as stated by Nanbu in the abstract portion of the English translation.

Art Unit: 2815

With regard to claims 12 and 24, Nanbu discloses in figure 1 that the third and fourth contacts are located on either side of a stack of layers of semiconductor materials.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed February 1, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

8. With regard to the applicant's arguments that "according to figure 4 [of Rosencher], the thickness of the transfer barrier layer is about 200A and the thickness of the quantum well is about 100A," however, a quick review of figure 4 of Rosencher shows a quantum well layer extending between the positions of about 200A and about 280A, thus the layer is about 80A thick. A further review of figure 4 shows that the applicant is correct in the assessment that the transfer barrier is about 200A thick. 200A is clearly about one order of magnitude greater than 80A. Further, the term "about" used to describe "an order of magnitude" in the claim broadens the scope of the definition of an order of magnitude. For at least these reasons the rejection is proper.

9. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the present invention recites the thickness of the transfer layer is one order of magnitude greater than a thickness of the quantum well") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are



Art Unit: 2815

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### *Conclusion*

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E Brock II whose telephone number is (703)308-6236. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703)308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2815

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

Paul E Brock II  
February 13, 2002



EDDIE LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800